

REMARKS

Claims 1, 4, 5, 7, and 8 are pending in the present application. Claim 1 has been amended by this response. Claim 7 has been canceled. Claims 10-12 have been newly added. The Examiner is respectfully requested to withdraw the rejections in view of the amendments and the following remarks.

CLAIM REJECTIONS UNDER 35 USC § 103

Claims 1, 4, 5, 7, and 8 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hara Chie et al. (JP 08-281856; "Chie") in view of Tsai (US 6,335,150; "Tsai"). Claim 1 has been amended to further describe the subject matter.

Claim 1, as amended, recites a transparent coordinate input device which includes a first transparent base material that is disposed below a second transparent base material. A plurality of ridge portions are formed only on a surface of the first transparent base material which faces the second transparent base material, and the ridge portions are transparent, have a polygonal shape in section, are narrow in width, and are projected strips longitudinally extending in one direction. The ridge portions adjacent to each other are formed with a predetermined pitch and formed by continuously extending the ridge portions. In rejecting claim 1, the Office Action, at page 3 concedes that Chie fails to disclose that the ridge portions have a polygonal shape in section and are projected strips longitudinally extending in one direction. To supplement Chie's deficiencies, the Office Action cites to Tsai, at Figs. 1-4, for disclosure of the missing feature. Specifically, the Office Action points to the structure "micro-mirror faces 52" as teaching the ridges as recited in claim 1, as amended, and asserts that it would have been obvious to modify Chie's ridges to include Tsai's ridges, motivated by the desire to produce uniform light and

reduce glare. However, the Applicant respectfully submits that Tsai fails to supplement Chie as to form a basis for a rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 103.

First, Tsai fails to teach ridge portions that are transparent, have a polygonal shape in section, are narrow in width, and that the ridge portions adjacent to each other are formed with a predetermined pitch and formed by continuously extending the ridge portions. Tsai is directed to a method of manufacturing a reflecting panel of reflective liquid crystal displays. (Tsai, Abstract). Tsai teaches that rough etched bottom faces 33 are formed through incomplete development/etching so that a rough surface is obtained on multiple exposed sections 31. (Tsai, col. 2, lines 53-55). Not exposed sections 32 are then given a heat treatment to form a micro-mirror face protuberance 34. (Tsai, col. 3, lines 7-13). Next, metal film 5 for reflecting light beam is precipitated on the micro-mirror face protuberances 34 to form multiple spreading faces 51 and multiple micro-mirror faces 52. (Tsai, col. 3, lines 14-23). The multiple micro-mirror faces 52 are separated from each other by the multiple spreading faces 51. (Tsai, Figure 4). Thus, Tsai teaches multiple micro-mirror faces 52 which reflect light and are separated from each other, rather than teaching transparent ridge portions that are formed by continuously extending the ridge portions, as recited in claim 1, as amended. Therefore, Tsai fails to supplement Chie to teach or suggest all the features of claim 1, as amended.

In addition, Chie and Tsai fail to teach that the first transparent base material is disposed below the second transparent base material, and that a plurality of ridge portions are formed only on a surface of the first transparent base material which faces the second transparent base material, as recited in claim 1, as amended. The configuration as recited in claim 1, as amended, enables the second transparent base material, when pressed by an indicating member, to be easily deformed in an in-plane contact manner to securely detect coordinates. On the other hand, Chie

teaches that the transparent conductive film 3 (ridge portions) is disposed on the second base material 1 (upper base material). Thus, when the ridge portion of Chie is modified with the micro-mirror face 52 of Tsai, anisotropy is generated in in-plane press rigidity, and the upper material 1 would be difficult to be deformed in a specific direction upon contact of a pressing member. Therefore, the Chie-Tsai combination fails to teach or suggest all the features of claim 1, as amended.

Lastly, Applicant respectfully asserts that Tsai cannot be properly combined with Chie because the proposed modification to Chie using Tsai would render Chie unsatisfactory for its intended purpose. See MPEP § 2143.01 citing *In re Gordon*, 733 F.2d 900, 221 USPQ 1125 (Fed. Cir. 1984) (If proposed modification would render the prior art invention being modified unsatisfactory for its intended purpose, then there is no suggestion or motivation to make the proposed modification.). Chie is directed to providing a transparent conductive film or sheet to suppress the generation of an interference fringe and not damaging the visibility of a display element when a touch panel is pressed. On the other hand, as noted above, Tsai is directed to providing a method of manufacturing a reflecting panel where the strength of the reflected light is controlled. (Tsai, Abstract). Tsai teaches that reflected light is controlled by providing the spreading faces 51 having multiple irregular protrusions. However, Tsai is silent as to how the features of the multiple micro-mirror faces 52 control reflected light, other than teaching that light beam reflected by the micro-mirror faces is “uniform[ed]” by the spreading faces 51. (See, Tsai, col. 3, lines 31-37). Therefore, one having ordinary skill in the art seeking to provide a transparent film to suppress the generation of interference fringes would have had no reason to combine the disclosure of Chie with that of Tsai, since adding a light-reflecting structure as taught in Tsai to a transparent film of Chie would not be reasonably expected to reduce

interference and would only decrease the transparency of the film, rendering Chie unsatisfactory for its intended purpose. Therefore none of the cited references, either singly or in combination, teach all the features of claim 1, as amended. Accordingly, claim 1 is patentable over the cited references.

Claims 4, 5 and 8 are also patentable over the cited references as dependent claims of claim 1.

NEW CLAIMS

Claims 10-12 have been newly added. Support for claims 10-12 are found, for example, at Applicant's Specification, at page 14, lines 23-25 (claim 10), at page 16, lines 8-10 (claim 11), and at page 16, lines 13-15 (claim 12). Applicant respectfully asserts that claims 10-12 are patentable over the cited references.

CONCLUSION

Based on the above remarks, Applicant respectfully submits that the claims are in condition for allowance. The Examiner is kindly invited to contact the undersigned attorney to expedite allowance.

Respectfully submitted,

/Gustavo Siller, Jr./

Gustavo Siller, Jr.
Registration No. 32,305
Attorney for Applicant

BRINKS HOFER GILSON & LIONE
P.O. BOX 10395
CHICAGO, ILLINOIS 60610
(312) 321-4200